

simultaneously presented on said display device together with the simultaneous textual display of the original flight and the modified flight plan,

wherein said interface device allows an operator to change the modified flight plan on either the textual display or the graphical display,

wherein the graphical display of the modified flight plan is updated when the modified flight plan is changed, and

wherein, when the modified flight plan is activated to become a new flight plan, the graphical display is updated to display only the new flight plan.

Supt 10
B1
Please add Claim 48 as follows:

48. (New) A navigational system according to Claim 38, wherein a textual display presented by said logic comprises a text list of way points that are on the original flight plan and the modified flight plan, and performance data for common way points that are in both the original flight plan and the modified flight plan.

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 11, 18, 28, 38 and 39 being independent.

Claim 48 has been added to provide an additional scope of protection.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 20-32 and 38-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Deker '987 in view of the newly cited reference to Bang '163. In addition, Claims 6-10, 16, 17, 33-37, and 43-47 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over those patents and further in view of Lions '632, also newly cited. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention is directed to a navigational system comprised of a display device that includes a graphical display portion and a textual display portion, and logic for displaying information on the display device. As claimed, the logic simultaneously presents a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on the display device.

Claim 11 relates to a navigational system that includes display means with a graphical display portion and a textual display portion, and logic means for simultaneously, textually displaying an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on the display means.

Claims 18 and 28 relate to a method of displaying a flight plan and a computer executable code for implementing such a method, respectively, and correspond substantially to Claim 1. In these claims, therefore, a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan are simultaneously displayed on the display device.

Claim 38 relates to a navigational system comprised of a CPU, a flight control system that controls an airplane based on inputs from the CPU, and a display device. Additionally, logic simultaneously presents a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on the display device, with the CPU providing inputs to the flight control system based on navigational data corresponding to the original flight plan presented on the display device.

Lastly, Claim 39 relates to a navigational system that includes a display device and logic that simultaneously presents a textual display of comparative data for an original flight plan and a modified flight plan on the display device.

The Deker patent relates to a navigational system that includes a display screen 11 with a graphical display portion and a textual display portion. As understood, the system is capable of providing alternate flight plan solutions to a pilot in response to an "event" or an

emergency. It is acknowledged that Deker shows a display with both graphic and textual information. What Deker does not show, however, is a simultaneous textual display of an active flight plan and a modified flight plan. Deker is discussed in further detail in the previous Amendment of March 20, 2002, which is incorporated herein by reference.

The secondary citation to Bang relates to an aircraft navigation control system capable of changing a flight path both graphically and textually. Additional details of this patent are discussed in the Description of the Related Art section of the subject application, on page 2, lines 17-24 (Bang was cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of April 12, 2001).

The Office Action relies on Bang for teaching the "simultaneously display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan." The Office Action fails to assert, however, that Bang simultaneously presents a "textual" display of the original flight plan and a modified flight plan, and it is submitted that such a teaching is not provided by Bang. In Figures 7, 8 and 9 in Bang, it is apparent that the textual display 20 does not simultaneously display an original flight plan and a modified flight plan. The textual display 20 in Figure 7 displays only proposed modified waypoints (BEEHI and HUMPP) to be added to the flight plan and proposed original waypoints (LACRE and VAMPS) to be deleted. Figure 8 additionally shows the TAGOR waypoint entered in a scratch pad area 26 (because the cursor 74 is within $\frac{1}{2}$ inch of the TAGOR waypoint at position 110, see column 6, lines 30-32). In Figure 9, however, when the TAGOR waypoint is selected to complete a modified flight plan, the original flight plan is deleted (see column 6, lines 35-40). Therefore, the simultaneous textual display of the original flight plan and the modified flight plan on the display 20 is not accomplished.

Moreover, Claims 2, 12, 19, 29, 40 and 48 of Applicants' invention further feature the textual display as comprised of a text list of waypoints that are on the original flight plan and the modified flight plan and performance data for common waypoints that are in both

the original flight plan and the modified flight plan. Neither Deker nor Bang is read to teach or suggest this feature of Applicants' claimed invention. On this point, the Office Action indicates that Deker provides a text list of waypoints and performance data on the original flight plan and the modified flight plan, citing column 8, lines 1-38. This portion of Deker has been reviewed but is not understood to teach providing performance data for common waypoints that are both in the original flight plan and the modified flight plan.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of Deker and Bang, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-5, 11-15, 28-32 and 38-42 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Lions (also cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of April 12, 2002) relates to a navigation system and was cited for its teaching of removing textual display waypoints on the original flight plan. Lions fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Deker and Bang as discussed above with respect to Applicant's independent claims. Namely, Lions fails to teach or suggest, among other features, simultaneously presenting a textual display of an original flight plan and a modified flight plan. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of Claims 6-10, 16, 17, 33-37 and 43-47 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 11, 18, 28, 38 and 39 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-27, 29-37 and 40-48 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. In Claims 8-10, 25-27, 35-37 and 45-47, for example, a graphical display of the original flight plan and the modified flight plan are simultaneously presented on the display device together with the simultaneous textual display of the original flight plan and the

modified flight plan. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to Honeywell's address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Scott D. Malpede
Registration No. 32,533

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
Law Department
101 Columbia Road
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, New Jersey 07962-2245

SDM:mm
DC_MAIN 105988 v 1